



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,977	09/12/2006	Michael Harold Rock	05432/1200962-US1	8787
7278	7590	10/02/2009	EXAMINER	
DARBY & DARBY P.C. P.O. BOX 770 Church Street Station New York, NY 10008-0770			COLEMAN, BRENDA LIBBY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/02/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/597,977	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ROCK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Brenda L. Coleman	<b>Art Unit</b> 1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 and 52-54 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 and 52-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/21/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-48 and 52-54 are pending in the application.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 48 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988); Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the

quantity of experimentation needed.

The nature of the invention in the instant case, has claims which embrace CEP-1347.

HOW TO USE: The scope of “CNS” or “neurodegenerative diseases” cannot be deemed enabled. The notion that a compound could be effective against central nervous system or neurodegenerative diseases in general is contrary to our current understanding of how pharmacologicals work. All attempts to find a pharmaceutical to treat central nervous system or neurodegenerative diseases generally have thus failed.

In view of the lack of direction provided in the specification regarding starting materials, the lack of working examples, and the general unpredictability of chemical reactions, it would take an undue amount of experimentation for one skilled in the art to make the claimed compounds and therefore practice the invention. To be enabling, the specification of a patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. The applicants' are not entitled to preempt the efforts of others. The test for determining compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, is whether the applicants have clearly defined their invention.

Additionally, the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims where the compounds of Compound I are used to inhibit c-Jun, in addition to the treatment of a magnitude of central nervous system or neurodegenerative diseases, etc. The intractability of these disorders is clear evidence that the skill level in this art is low relative to the difficulty of the task.

Art Unit: 1624

Where the utility is unusual or difficult to treat or speculative, the examiner has authority to require evidence that tests relied upon are reasonably predictive of in vivo efficacy by those skilled in the art. See *In re Ruskin*, 148 USPQ 221; *Ex parte Jovanovics*, 211 USPQ 907; MPEP 2164.05(a).

Patent Protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable. Tossing out the mere germ of an idea does not constitute enabling disclosure. *Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk* 42 USPQ2d 1001.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1, 2, 22, 25, 28, 31 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

- a. Claim 1 is vague and indefinite in that it does not end with a period indicating the end of the claim.
- b. Claim 2 is vague and indefinite in that it is not further limiting of claim 1.
- c. Claim 22 is a duplicate of claim 3.
- d. Claim 25 is a duplicate of claim 7.
- e. Claim 28 is a duplicate of claim 10.
- f. Claim 31 is a duplicate of claim 14.
- g. Claim 34 is a duplicate of claim 17.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-48 and 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaneko et al., Journal of Medicinal Chemistry. Kaneko teaches the compounds, compositions and method of use of the compounds of Compound 1 as set forth in example 8, i.e. 3,9-bis[(ethylthio)methyl]-K-252a which includes IR data, NMR data, etc.

The reference shows the compound, but is silent on the particular **crystalline** form. MPEP 2112 states:

“SOMETHING WHICH IS OLD DOES NOT BECOME PATENTABLE UPON THE DISCOVERY OF A NEW PROPERTY

The claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property, which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).”

In this case, the “unknown property” is the particular **crystalline** form. This is unknown because the reference is silent on this property. MPEP 2112 goes on to state:

“A REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102/103 CAN BE MADE WHEN THE PRIOR ART PRODUCT SEEMS TO BE IDENTICAL EXCEPT THAT THE PRIOR ART IS SILENT AS TO AN INHERENT CHARACTERISTIC

Where applicant claims a composition in terms of a function, property or

Art Unit: 1624

characteristic and the composition of the prior art is the same as that of the claim but the function is not explicitly disclosed by the reference, the examiner may make a rejection under both 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, expressed as a 102/103 rejection.”

Again, the “CHARACTERISTIC” which the prior art is silent on is the amorphous form (amorphous form is considered to be in the category of chemical properties; see *Zenith Laboratories Inc. v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.* 30 USPQ2d 1285, 1288).

This is not an ordinary inherency situation where it is not explicitly stated what the product actually is. In every reference applied, the reference explicitly teaches exactly what the compound is. In fact, it is the opposite. In a normal inherency situation, the claim is of known structure, and the reference is of unknown structure. Here, the reverse is true, and hence the legal circumstances of inherency-in-the-prior-art do not apply. The only difference is the property about which the reference happens to be silent.

See for example *Ex parte Anderson*, 21 USPQ 2d 1241 at 1251, discussion of Rejection E. The claims had “numerical or functional values for certain properties which [the authors of the references] did not measure”. The PTO presented no reasoning as to why the prior art material would have been expected to have those properties. Instead, the decision states, “There is ample precedent for shifting the burden to an applicant to reproduce a prior art product whose final structure or properties are, at least, in part determined by the precise process used in its manufacture.” (page 1253).

In another example, certain claims of *Ex parte Raychem Corp.* 25 USPQ2d 1265 required a linearity ratio of less than 1.2. The decision notes that neither reference

Art Unit: 1624

discloses any values of the linearity ratio. The PTO presented no reasoning as to what the ratio would be expected to be in the references. The Decision states: "However, this does not end the inquiry since, where the Patent and Trademark Office is not equipped to perform the needed testing, it is reasonable to shift the burden of proof to Raychem to establish that (1) the argued difference exists...."

And indeed, there have been a number of cases in which applicants have pointed to silence of the prior art with regard to this or that property: *In re Pearson*, 181 USPQ 641; *In re Zierden* 162 USPQ 102; *In re Lemin*, 140 USPQ 273; *Titanium Metals Corporation of America v. Banner*, 227 USPQ 773; *In re Benner*, 82 USPQ 49. Going further, if silence about properties of prior art compounds could be relied on, then one could not reject over references with no utility (see *In re Schoenwald*, 22 USPQ2d 1671), since applicants could always insert the utility into the claim as a property.

It is well settled that the PTO can require an applicant to establish that a prior art product does not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed product when the prior art and claimed products are identical or substantially identical. An applicant's burden under these circumstances was described in *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433-434 (CCPA 1977) as follows:

Where, as here, the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product. . . . Whether the rejection is based on 'inherency' under 35 U.S.C. § 102, or 'prima facie obviousness' under 35 U.S.C. § 103, jointly or alternatively, the burden of proof is the same, and its fairness is evidenced by the PTO's inability to manufacture products or to obtain and compare prior art products (footnote omitted).



Art Unit: 1624

Overcoming the rejection is very straightforward. One simply replicates the prior art procedure. If the amorphous form does not appear at all in the product, or if on repetition, it sometimes does not appear in the product, then the rejection is overcome.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda L. Coleman whose telephone number is 571-272-0665. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brenda L. Coleman/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624